CONNECTICUT LAW



Published in Accordance with General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 35

JOURNAL

February 25, 2020

240 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Rutter v. Janis, 334 C 722	2
out-of-court statement was harmless; claim that trial court improperly instructed jury on third-party culpability by omitting names of alleged third-party culprits. Volume 334 Cumulative Table of Cases	57
CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS	
Al-Fikey v. Obaiah, 196 CA 13	15A
Bordiere v. Ciarcia Construction, LLC, 196 CA 70	72A
Carabetta Organization, Ltd. v. Meriden, 196 CA 147	149A
Compass Bank v. Dunn, 196 CA 43	45A
Constituted on most m	

(continued on next page)

Dickau v. Mingrone, 196 CA 59	61A
plaintiff's property; whether record was sufficient to support trial court's finding; claim that trial court erred in not finding that plaintiff established existence	
of damages.	
Hogfeldt v . Board of Education (Memorandum Decision), 196 CA 901 Jepsen v . Camassar, 196 CA 97	161A 99A
Declaratory judgment; action seeking declaration that certain modifications made by beach association to restrictive covenants in beach deed were invalid; claim that trial court improperly denied plaintiffs' postjudgment motion for equitable relief because this court's order of remand in first appeal required trial court to address their claims for quiet title and injunctive relief; claim that trial court improperly denied postjudgment motion for fees and costs; claim that, even assuming that this court's mandate in first appeal did not encompass claims of certain plaintiffs to quiet title, equitable relief, and fees and costs, trial court improperly denied their motion to open to provide them with their requested relief; claim that trial court violated several state and federal constitutional rights of certain plaintiffs by failing to hear or grant their postjudgment motions.	
Lemanski v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Memorandum Decision), 196 CA 901	161A 33A
of first amendment by rendering judgment of marital dissolution; whether trial court abused its discretion when it entered certain orders regarding minor child's travel and education as part of judgment of dissolution.	
Peterson v. Torrington, 196 CA 52	54A
Presto v. Presto, 196 CA 22	24A
Starboard Resources, Inc. v. Henry, 196 CA 80	82A
	,

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes \S 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications Office of Production and Distribution 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178 www.jud.ct.gov

Richard J. Hemenway, $Publications\ Director$

 $Published\ Weekly-Available\ at\ \underline{\text{https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal}}$

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by Eric M. Levine, Reporter of Judicial Decisions Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

mature for this court to consider merits of parties' purportedly adverse claims to shares; whether trial court properly exercised its authority to remand matter to clarify arbitration award as to ownership of shares; whether trial court violated doctrine of functus officio. Thompson v. Commission of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 196 CA 901 Turek v. Zoning Board of Appeals, 196 CA 122	161A 124A
Wachovia Mortgage, FSB v. Toczek, 196 CA 1. Foreclosure; motion for summary judgment as to liability; motion for judgment of strict foreclosure; motion to reargue; claim that trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction because plaintiff did not have standing because it was not holder of subject note; claim that note was nonnegotiable instrument pursuant to relevant statute (§ 42a-3-104 (a)) because it was not for fixed amount of money and was governed by federal law; claim that trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion for summary judgment as to liability; whether trial court abused its discretion by granting motion for judgment of strict foreclosure; whether plaintiff complied with requirement in applicable rule of practice (§ 23-18) that preliminary statement of monetary claim be filed no less than five days prior to hearing on motion for judgment of strict foreclosure; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it denied defendant's motion to reargue judgment of strict foreclosure.	3A
Volume 196 Cumulative Table of Cases	163A
SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES	
Summaries	1B
MISCELLANEOUS	
Notice of Reprimand of Attorneys	2C 2C 1C
Appointments	1C